

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

DATE MAILED:

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO 09/498,102 02/04/00 LUCH D **EXAMINER** IM22/0618 Daniel Luch CHAPMAN, M 17161 Copper Hill Drive PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** Morgan Hill CA 95037 1753

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

06/18/01

,				
·		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/498,102	LUCH, DANIEL	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mark A. Chapman	1753	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM				
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply is specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 /	<u>//ay 2001</u> .		
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 2-30 is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-30</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.				
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).				
Attachment(s)				
<ul> <li>15)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>16)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>17)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 &amp;</li> </ul>		19) Notice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Il Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1753

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 2-30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 5,735,966. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed combination is directly related to the intermediate already patented for the same intended use in photovoltaic applications.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/498,102

Art Unit: 1753

4. Claims 2-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yoshida (5,421,908). Yoshida teaches the claimed photovoltaic cell and substrate combination with conductive and insulation regions (col. 7 lines 23-36), the holes through the substrate filled with conductive solder (col. 8-9), and series connection of a number of cells (col. 9-11), and the position of the metal foils (figures).

- 5. Claims 2-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yoshida (5,626,686). Yoshida teaches the claimed photovoltaic cell and substrate combination with conductive and insulation regions, the holes through the substrate filled with conductive solder, and series connection of a number of cells, the overlap of the metal foil and conductive region of the substrate, and the physical relationship of the various parts of the array (col. 5 line 31, col. 7 line 3, and figures).
- 6. Claims 2-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Grimmer (5,385,848). Grimmer teaches the claimed photovoltaic cell and substrate combination with conductive and insulating regions and series connection of a number of cells, the physical relationship of parts of the array, and laminating the substrates to the solar cells (col. 3-9 and figures).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Chapman whose telephone number is 703-308-4430. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-3322. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 1753

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3599 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-2351.

Mark A. Chapman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753

MC June 17, 2001